

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to the Office action mailed on July 19, 2005. Claims 2, 6-7, 9, 13, 15-16 and 20 have been cancelled; claims 1, 3 12 and 18-19 have been amended. Support for all claim amendments appears in the original set of claims as filed and Fig. 2 as filed. No new matter is added thereby.

The office action objects to claims 9, 18 and 19 due to some informalities. In response, claim 9 has been cancelled and claims 18 and 19 have been amended to traverse these objections.

The office action rejects claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. In response, claim 1 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for “the first arm” of claim 8 thereby traversing this rejection.

Next, the office action rejects claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 1,594,516 (“Derosha”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0038573 (“Knight”). In response, independent claims 1, 12 and 19 have been amended to traverse this rejection.

Specifically, each independent claim required the pulley gear and the pulley shaft connecting the pulley gear to the drive pulley to be disposed within the body of the middle arm of the c-shaped bracket. Further, each pending independent claim has been amended to make it clear that the c-shaped bracket has an open front. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments traverse the rejections based upon Derosha and Knight.

Specifically, under MPEP § 2142,

[t]o establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant’s disclosure.

Citing, In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *see also* MPEP § 2143-§ 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.

Derosha, the base reference, does not teach or suggest the c-shaped bracket with an open front as recited in each pending independent claim. The Derosha bracket 1 is an enclosed, rectangular frame.

Further, Derosha does not teach or suggest a pulley gear disposed within a middle arm of a c-shaped bracket or a pulley shaft that connects a pulley gear to a drive pulley that is disposed within a middle arm of a c-shaped bracket. Instead, the Derosha pulley gear 12 is disposed outside of the frame 1 as is the connecting shaft 13.

Knight, on the other hand, is merely cited for the proposition that it teaches endless belts as an alternative to the gear train 14/15/16 of the Derosha. Knight does not teach or suggest a c-shaped bracket or a design which includes a c-shaped bracket or a design which includes a c-shaped bracket with a middle arm that accommodates the pulley gear and the shaft that connects the pulley gear to the drive pulley.

Accordingly, no combination of Derosha and Knight teaches or suggests every element of the pending independent claims and therefore the obviousness rejection fails to meet the standards of § 2142. An early action indicating the allowability of this patent application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-3629.

Dated: October 19, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael R. Hull

Registration No.: 35,902

MILLER, MATTHIAS & HULL

One North Franklin Street

Suite 2350

Chicago, Illinois 60606

(312) 977-9902, ext. 203

Attorney for Applicant